

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Enited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOX:KET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/603,864 06/26/2003		06/26/2003	Mu Jen Lai	MR1035-1265	1418		
4586	7590	05/09/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER		
	•	EIN & LEE	HITESHEW, FELISA CARLA				
3458 ELLICOTT CENTER DRIVE-SUITE 101 ELLICOTT CITY, MD 21043				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	·			1722	·		
				DATE MAILED: 05/09/200	DATE MAILED: 05/09/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1_	_	_

		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)				
·		10/603,86	4	LAI ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
		Felisa C. F		1722				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on _							
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ ⁻	This action is no	on-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allo	owance except	for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	e merits is			
	closed in accordance with the practice und	ler <i>Ex par</i> te Qu	ayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	on of Claims							
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application	on.						
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with		nsideration.					
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.							
·	Claim(s) 3-5 is/are objected to.							
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election re	equirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exan	miner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachmen	t(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)								
2) Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948		Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate	O 152\			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:								

Ja

Application/Control Number: 10/603,864 Page 2

Art Unit: 1722

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103The following is a quotation of 35
 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 3. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Udagawa '346 B2.

Application/Control Number: 10/603,864

Art Unit: 1722

Udagawa "346 B2 teaches a similar Group III-V and Boron Phosphide-based semiconductor light-emitting device, comprising a bottom electrode (107), a substrate (101), a buffer layer (102), a first boron-phosphide semiconductor layer (103, a light-emitting layer (104), a second boron-phosphide semiconductor layer (105), a projection region (109), upper electrode (106b), and lower electrode (106a).

The difference being that the arrangement of the layers varies from that of the instant invention. However, in unobvious results, it would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the to modify and optimize the different layer in order to ensure proper orientation. The motivation being that the operation current can be caused to flow preferentially to a region of a device from which light is advantageously emitted, and thus the light-emitting device exhibits high emission intensity.

A reference is good not only for what it teaches by direct anticipation but also for what one of ordinary skill might reasonably infer from the teachings. In re Opprect 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (CAFC 1989); In re Bode 193 USPQ 12; In re Lamberti 192 USPQ 278; In re Bozek 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969); In re Van Mater 144 USPQ 421; In re Jacoby 135 USPQ 317; In re LeGrice 133 USPQ 365; In re Preda 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968).

Expected beneficial results are evidence of obviousness, just as unexpected beneficial results are evidence of unobviousness. In re Novak 16 USPQ 2d 2041 (Fed. Cir., BPAI 1989); In re Hoffman 194 USPQ 126 (CCPA 1977); In re Skoll 187 USPQ 481 (CCPA 1975); In re Skoner 186 USPQ 80 (CCPA 1975); In re

Application/Control Number: 10/603,864

Art Unit: 1722

Garshon 152 USPQ 602 (CCPA 1967)

In addition, specific size and range of semiconductor layer as claimed in claims 13 and 21 are taken to be obvious since these are variables of art recognized importance which are subject to routine experimentation and optimization and discovery of an optimum value for a known process and changes in size or range are obvious. In Re Reven, 156 USPQ 679 (CCPA 1968), In re Rose, 105 USPQ (CCPA 1955), In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955). And, even if applicants' modification results in great improvement and utility over the prior art, it may still not be patentable if the modification was within the capabilities of one skilled in the art, In Re Sola 25 USPQ 433.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Felisa Hiteshew whose telephone number is (571) 272-1463. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Thursdays from 4:30 AM to 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Benjamin Utech, can be reached on (571) 272-1137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-1463.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Application/Control Number: 10/603,864

Art Unit: 1722

•

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system. see

http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866- 217-9 197

(toll-free).

FELISA HITESHEW

Page 5

AU 1772